

CDPAC Meeting Minutes
Thursday, June 7, 2001
State Capitol Building

Welcome and Introductions

Chairperson, *Kathy Malaske-Samu* called the meeting to order and welcomed attendees. She thanked staff and complemented them on their development of today's exciting agenda. Committee, staff and audience members introduced themselves.

Director's Report

Executive Director, *Kay Ryan* provided an overview of the full agenda. Since the last meeting, both the May Revise, the Governor's revised budget proposal for State Fiscal Year 2001-02, and the State and Consumer Services Agency Review of Child Care Financing were released. Dan Galpern will share the California Budget Project's analysis of both of these important documents.

Both houses of the Legislature have adopted their respective versions of the state budget (as budget bills) and the Conference Committee is meeting to resolve the differences between the Senate and Assembly versions. They have until June 15 to adopt a compromise version of the budget. The Governor then has 15 days to review, amend (using his veto authority – or blue pencil) and sign it into law. The child care issues being considered by the Conference Committee include: Before and After School Programs, Child Care for Foster Parents (AB 1105, approved in April) and the Child Care Facilities Financing Program.

This is the time of year when some bills graduate and go on and others are held back for another year. Bills that did not make it out of suspense by June 1st become two-year bills. This happened to AB 298, which is on our agenda. However, because this bill raised some interesting policy issues, Kathy Dresslar, Pat Dorman and Donita Stromgren are here today to discuss those issues.

We are also very fortunate to have with us today Scott Groginsky and Lee Posey from the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). Thanks to the generous support of Senator Jim Costa, we are able to benefit from their wealth of knowledge about what is happening in Washington, D.C. and in other states regarding issues such as Before and After School Care and the reauthorization of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), and the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG).

Ms. Ryan announced the appointment of Kathy Malaske-Samu to the new position of Director of the Office of Child Care, County of Los Angeles. With more children in the County of Los Angeles than there are people in at least 14 states, and a child care industry that is larger than the economy of some small countries, staff felt that a tiara was a fitting symbol of the importance of this new position and presented one to Kathy in hopes she will wear it in good health and humor and that it will serve as a reminder to all of the importance of quality early care and education for our children.

Committee Business

Ms. Malaske-Samu thanked Ms. Ryan for the update and for the presentation and thanked everyone for supporting her during the hiring process for the new position. She noted that Committee business has been moved up on today's agenda.

The Committee adopted the May 2001 minutes as drafted.

Dianne Philibosian, Nominating Committee, called Committee members' attention to the ballots in today's packet and asked for the ballots to be collected and tallied.

The Committee voted unanimously to provide the Executive Director with the authority to sign contract renewals up to 10 percent above amounts authorized for SFY 2000-01 on its behalf during the summer months.

Dianne Philibosian announced that the slate of officers for 2001-2003 has been unanimously approved by ballot vote of Committee members. The officers are: Chair - Kathleen Malaske-Samu, Vice Chair - Lynn Lucas, Treasurer - Robert Orsi, and Secretary - Marie Kanne Poulsen. Dr. Philibosian welcomed them to their new term of office.

Ms. Malaske-Samu thanked the Committee and extended a special thank you to staff for weathering a storm of changes. The Committee is contributing to solutions for children in California and they could not do this without the staff. She appreciates the day-to-day work staff does to make the Committee viable.

Governor's Mentoring Partnership – How We Connect

Jim Kooler, Governor's Office of Planning and Research

Ms. Malaske-Samu introduced and welcomed Dr. Kooler and said this is an interesting new project. He said he applauds the great work of the CDPAC. He currently works on the mentoring program after six years at the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP) as Deputy Director of their Prevention Services Division. They saw mentoring as a way to reduce alcohol and drug related issues. Research shows that children involved with mentoring do better in school, have lower pregnancy rates, and are more able to avoid violent situations. This led ADP to link with other prevention agencies around mentoring as a strategy to help young people.

The Governor's Mentoring Partnership supports all of the quality mentoring programs available to young people. The classic mentoring program is the Big Brothers Big Sisters program, but there are many other kinds of mentoring. In elementary school, mentoring focuses on children's academic and social skills, making sure they get the basic skills and learn communication skills. In middle school, mentoring focuses on community service. For high school, the focus is on school as a career. Mentoring programs need to be developmentally appropriate, rather than "one size fits all."

In the past six years, over \$100 million has been dedicated to mentoring programs in California. About 450 mentoring programs in the state have met quality assurance standards. Those standards include making sure programs do background checks, conduct interviews, provide training, and support the [mentor to mentee] matches. The standards also make sure that the young people understand what they are getting into, and, at the end of the match, that there is closure. When those standards are met, in California the retention of mentors is close to 70 percent compared to 30 percent for the rest of the country. Dr. Kooler spoke about his experience as a mentor to a young boy.

Our efforts seem to align nicely with the efforts of CDPAC, and we're here today to explore the possibility of working together. The after school programs is an important piece. We propose to invite you to become a partner and sponsor with us as we look at documenting where mentoring fits into the after school setting. The 21st Century money and other resources provide young people with a safe place to go. We believe that mentoring will support and enhance these resources so that the outcomes for young people will be even greater. Many programs incorporate mentoring, but there is little documentation about where it fits best, for what ages, how to do it, and what are the best practices. The University of California at Santa Barbara, School of Education, has agreed to bring together mentors to get their best thinking in a "think tank" setting, conduct case studies, hold interviews, and prepare a report by October. We would like to invite you to join us October 16, 17

and 18 when First Lady Sharon Davis will host a national summit on mentoring at the Disney Resort. We hope to provide attendees with a document they can take with them and use as a tool to enhance their mentoring efforts.

The Mentoring Partnership's partnership with the Committee would help support the research on best practices used by after school programs involved with mentoring. This will become the first chapter of a larger series. There are a number of issues we want to address and hope to find partners with interests in those different areas. For example, we want to look at the foster care system and how mentoring fits with that group. There also are issues about recruitment and retention. By the end of the year, we will have a strategic plan about where mentoring should be headed over the next ten years.

It was suggested the Dr. Kooler contact the California Park and Recreation Society. There is a nexus between child development and recreation.

Q. Do parents have to give permission for their child to partner with a mentor?

A. Yes. Programs always work with the parents. One of our principles is that mentors are a support for the family, not a competitor. Parents must sign off. The exception is that the court, rather than the parents, sign off for foster children.

Q. Who else would we be partnering with?

A. UC, Santa Barbara. The ADP may have some resources for this project. The California Mentor Foundation, a private nonprofit group, will be a partner and will have the lead on this effort.

Q. Will you do much work with elementary age children or children age 0-5 years?

A. There will be very little with children 0-5. We are not sure how mentoring fits in with that population. The bulk of our school-based academic mentoring programs focus on children in grades 3 or 4 through 6.

Q. Do you have a time limit on a mentor, is it generally only during the school year?

A. Most programs are for a school year. Research shows that the relationship should last at least six months; less than six months may do more harm than good. At the end of a school year, we give the child and mentor the opportunity to continue for another year. The Governor and First Lady have set a goal of one million quality annual mentor matches by 2005. We ask for a commitment of one year, but it is usually after two years that a change is noticed in a child's life.

Q. Can the mentoring programs accommodate the needs of the growing numbers of relatives, often senior citizens, both in and out of the system, who care for children? Do you have a waiting period?

A. We have a waiting list of 70,000 young people who are waiting for a caring adult. We are working on a memorandum of understanding with AARP to be able to recruit their membership. They are eager to be involved because research has shown as much benefit for the mentor as for the child. We expect a national announcement from AARP in October on their commitment to children through intergenerational mentoring.

Q. To clarify, would the money you are requesting from CDPAC support the research and report being done by UC Santa Barbara? Would the Committee be recognized on the report?

A. Yes to both questions. Also, we would like a representative from CDPAC to attend the "think tank" meeting tentatively scheduled for July 9 in Santa Barbara.

Q. Are any Committee members involved as mentors?

A. Yes, Bonnie Parks is a mentor. Dr. Kooler noted that, for state employees, the State of California will match 40 hours of your time for volunteering with a quality approved mentoring

program. Anyone interested in volunteering as a mentor can call 1-888-806-3686, give your zip code, and they will find a program for you. Or on the web, go to www.opr.ca.gov, on the left side, click on Governor's Mentoring Partnership to bring up the state employee mentor page, click on Get Involved, then enter your zip code to see the mentoring programs in your community. I can guarantee that you will enjoy this as much or more as the child you mentor will.

Q. Will the report pinpoint groups of mentors? For example, will it give the positive or negative aspects of having a young adult or a senior as a mentor?

A. Due to the short time frame, we won't be doing this ourselves, but may learn information like this from the mentors who participate. We expect the report will reflect the models of using, for example, seniors or college students as mentors.

Q. Are service clubs involved in mentoring programs?

A. Yes, they are coming forward in a positive way. For example, the Rotary Club in Sacramento has adopted a group of young people for a 10-year period, including helping them with scholarships through college.

After verifying that resources were available, the Committee voted unanimously to partner with the Governor's Mentoring Partnership.

Ms. Malaske-Samu made a personal commitment to get involved in this program. Ms. Ryan will contact Dr. Kooler regarding who will represent CDPAC at the July 9 meeting in Santa Barbara.

Dr. Philibosian and Dr. Kooler will be in contact regarding ideas for a model for involving 0-5 year olds in a mentoring program.

Dr. Kooler thanked the Committee for their support. CDPAC is the first group to make a commitment to the Governor's Mentoring Partnership and that will be recognized and acknowledged by the First Lady.

Ms. Malaske-Samu suggested that another possible group that might benefit from mentoring is parents with children in child care centers. They are so busy running that they often are frazzled. It would be good to have someone to support them and tell them they and their children are doing well. Dr. Philibosian described a Mothers Club project that will receive Prop 10 funding from Los Angeles County so that experienced parents may mentor less experienced parents. This is in concert with Ms. Malaske-Samu's suggestion and is a way to reach out to the under 5 population.

Cheri Schoenborn spoke about the parent-to-parent mentoring aspects in the foster grandparent program and the family resource center program funded through the Department of Developmental Services.

Ms. Malaske-Samu thanked Dr. Kooler and said the Committee looks forward to working with him. A CDPAC representative will attend the "think tank" meeting in Santa Barbara.

Before and After School Panel Discussion

Scott Groginsky, Program Manager, National Conference of State Legislatures (Moderator)

Deb Ferrin, Child Care Coordinator, City of San Diego

Barbara Kraybill, Youth Services Superintendent, Livermore

Lindsay Callahan, Program Analyst, Foundation Consortium

Ms. Malaske-Samu said that one of her visions for the role of CDPAC is to provide a forum to discuss issues from more than one perspective. We tend in our field to assume a position and not think about the other sides of it. There are different perspectives on how before and after school care

should be delivered. This discussion is an opportunity to take in new information about these perspectives. After the panel presentation, members will be asked to make some decisions about legislation. She introduced Scott Groginsky who will moderate the panel, and thanked Senator Costa for making Mr. Groginsky available to work with the Committee.

Mr. Groginsky said that before introducing the panel, he will discuss some key issues related to out-of-school time activities: important research findings, state legislative trends in before and after school enactments, and a few states' policies on significant after school regulatory issues. He will take questions after the panelist presentations. He noted that the NCSL takes no positions on state legislation or issues.

The Importance of After School Programs

Need

- ❑ Estimates are that between 7-15 million of the 28 million school age children return to empty homes after school.
- ❑ Between 3 and 4 p.m. is when most juvenile crime occurs as well as substance abuse and risk of teen pregnancy.
- ❑ Violent juvenile crime rates triple between 3 and 6 p.m.
- ❑ Television is the most common after school activity.

Availability

- ❑ Two-thirds of voters have difficulty finding quality, affordable after school programs.
- ❑ Twice as many elementary and middle school parents want after school programs than are available.
- ❑ The U.S. General Accounting Office projected that only about one-fourth of after school demand is met nationwide. Here in California, it is estimated that about half of the after school demand is being met.

Public Support

- ❑ Polls have found that most of the public thinks government at all levels should provide after school programs, and 60 percent would pay higher taxes for it.

Benefits

Sources for this information about benefits include U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Department of Education, U.S. Health and Human Services, state studies done in Ohio and Michigan, city studies done in Philadelphia and Los Angeles, the University of Wisconsin, and studies done for the YMCA and Boys and Girls Clubs after school programs.

- ❑ The benefits of after school programs are greatest for disadvantaged students. One quality after school program found a \$3 saving for every \$1 invested, not including a 60 percent drop in boys' crime.
- ❑ High quality programs have produced positive effects on children in the following ways:
 - Academic** - Better grades; better school conduct; more academic opportunities; better reading, language and math skills; better homework skills; better study skills; better grades; and more interest in school. Participants are twice as likely to continue their education after high school. Those who do not participate are twice as likely to drop out.
 - Behavior** - Better peer relations including less aggression in peer conflicts, better emotional adjustment in general, and higher self-esteem.
 - Crime** - An outgrowth of improved behavior in children is the greater likelihood they will avoid criminal activity. Studies have shown lower rates of violence, lower use of alcohol, tobacco and

other drugs, and less vandalism among children in quality after school programs. The Los Angeles BEST program found a 40-60 percent drop in crime among participants.

Legislative Trends in Before and After School Programs

Over the past five legislative sessions (since 1997), state legislatures have established laws and policies on before and after school programs, largely focusing on four key areas: funding, quality improvement, transportation and regulations.

Funding

- ❑ States use a variety of financing mechanisms to support out-of-school-time programs. These state approaches supplement the federal 21st Century Community Learning Centers funds that go directly from the federal government to local schools.
- ❑ Nearly all states draw on the CCDBG for school-age programs. There is a set-aside that specifically allows states to target dollars for after school programs. In addition, many states, including California, appropriate state dollars for these programs
- ❑ States are increasingly using TANF or state welfare money for before and after school programs to increase services, expand after school facilities, or for transportation to and from the programs. Several state legislatures required the state to incorporate after school programs into their welfare reform plans. New Jersey and West Virginia lawmakers required that after school services be a part of the state's assurance of proper child care in order to require a welfare family to engage in work activities. Illinois required a needs analysis for after school services for families transitioning off welfare as part of an overall child care needs assessment.
- ❑ Alabama and Maine use tobacco settlement dollars for after school programs. Several other states are proposing to do this as well.
- ❑ Colorado enacted a tax credit for family child care providers that serve school-age kids, and other states were considering similar tax credit bills.
- ❑ Tennessee is looking at using lottery proceeds. Illinois is looking at using a special license plate fund. Grants and bonds were also proposed in state legislatures this year.

Quality Improvement

- ❑ The Texas and Montana legislatures approved state funding for improving quality of after school programs. A 2000 Illinois law added funds to provide wage supplements to school-age workers as part of a wage incentive package for all child care teachers.

Transportation

- ❑ Several state legislatures established laws to facilitate transportation to and from before and after school programs. Iowa directed TANF funds for school-age transportation costs. New Hampshire gave statutory approval for school districts to transport kids. Rhode Island lawmakers approved a feasibility study for transportation. Six other states had after school transportation bills in this session.

Regulations

- ❑ Several legislative regulatory laws on after school programs gave specified exemptions from child care regulations. A few states enacted general exemptions for after school programs. For example, Minnesota exempted park and recreation after school programs, and Ohio exempted religious programs. Massachusetts' lawmakers added health and safety standards to school age programs a few years ago.

Key Regulatory Issues

About one-half of the states have after school regulations separate from child care regulations. The other half incorporate after school standards within child care regulations. A big issue among these is the ratio of staff to students.

Ratios

- ❑ California's after school programs must meet a 20:1 ratio. The U.S. Department of Education recommends a range of 10:1 to 15:1 ratio. The National Health and Safety Standards for Out of Home Care recommends a 10:1 ratio for children age 6 to 8 and a 12:1 ratio for children age 9 to 12. Only four states meet these ratios. A study of Sacramento Start two years ago found insignificant differences between students' test scores comparing a 20:1 ratio versus a 14:1 ratio, which is the ratio set under the state's Department of Social Services standards for after-school programs.
- ❑ As a comparison to California, in New York, the ratios are 10:1 for children up to age 9 and 15:1 for children ages 10-12. In Texas, one staff person can supervise up to 24 five year olds, but programs can have no more than 35 children, which in effect reduces this ratio to 17:1 at the maximum capacity. For children age 6-12 the ratio is 26:1, with the 35 child limit.

Settings

- ❑ In New York, programs can be located anywhere as long as the facility and space pass standards. In Texas, programs provided by schools also can take place anywhere, including on school grounds. If the programs are outside of the school, they are regulated by child care standards. If the school runs the program in Texas, the program is exempt from child care regulations. If a school contracts to another organization to run the program, the contractors are held to child care licensing requirements. Most schools in Texas do not operate their own programs. Texas is reviewing these issues because certain child care regulations for the age 0-5 population are considered less appropriate for school-age children.

Staff Qualifications

- ❑ In both New York and Texas, after school teachers can choose from a variety of classes when continuing their training and education. New York classes are responsive to child development principles, which is one of the topics available in Texas as well. Other possible training and education areas for teachers include age appropriate activities, self-esteem, health and safety, nutrition, special needs, cultural diversity, risk management, child abuse/neglect, and curriculum planning. All staff in both states must be at least 18 and program directors must have an Associate of Arts degree in child development. In Texas, this requirement is under review.

Q. Cheri Schoenborn asked if after school programs include children with special needs? If so, what are the staffing issues?

A. States are directing federal and state money into special needs child care. I haven't looked at that in terms of after school care but will do that and get back to you with the information.

Meeting participants discussed the ratio of children to classroom teachers, 35:1, compared to the much smaller ratio of children to before and after school staff. The difference in purpose and relationship was noted between the academic day and the non-academic day. Mr. Groginsky will see if there is research that compares rates and types of injuries with staffing ratios and report back with this information, as well. No matter what age, relationships and safety are key.

Ms. Malaske-Samu welcomed the panel members and Mr. Groginsky introduced them.

Deb Ferrin, Child Care Coordinator, City of San Diego

The 6 to 6 Extended School Day Program opened in every elementary and middle school in the City of San Diego this year. It is free to all schools. The program began three years ago with \$1.7 million from the City General Fund to serve 31 schools. The budget now is \$15.5 million to serve the 196 schools in the eight school districts. (\$4 million is from the City General Fund, \$2 million is from city tobacco settlement money, \$8.5 million is from the State After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnership Program Fund, and nearly \$1 million is from 21st Century grant money.) The budget may expand to \$20 million next year. The programs serve 25,000 families. Ninety-one percent of the 196 school principals, 95 percent of the children, and 99 percent of the parents rated the program good to outstanding. The toughest critics were middle school students where 88 percent gave it a good to outstanding rating.

Why would a city want a program like this? In 1995, San Diego did a livable neighborhood study asking people to rate community safety. As a result, the Mayor's Safe Schools Task Force studied the problems and potential solutions. From this, came a Critical Hours for Critical Years task force. The critical hours are 3-6 p.m. and the critical years are 12-14. Welfare reform happened about this time, which meant that 124,000 child care spaces would be needed for the children when their parents went to work. There was no way to build child care spaces fast enough to accommodate the needs of these families. So the mayor opened up the public schools for before and after school programs.

As part of the Carnegie Foundation and DeWitt-Wallace Foundation, a citywide after school initiative committee was formed. The committee meets annually with committees from several other large cities to share information about program models. There is a national groundswell of synergy around after school programs.

The vision is to open the public schools after school. Together we can create partnerships where schools provide the space; cities provide the funding, oversight, training and coordination; and community based organizations provide their skills and training.

Q. How did you solve the problem of teachers being possessive of their classroom space?
A. Our biggest hurdle is sharing of community space. We offer a \$150 gift certificate to a children's supply company to teachers who share their classroom.

Q. Your expansion was very fast. Where did the staff come from?
A. This was a huge challenge last year. Coinciding with the expansion, the superintendent let go 600 instructional aides and teaching assistants who now work in the 6 to 6 Program.

Q. What about the custodial staff? Are they working overtime?
A. We went to the custodians' union and asked them to do a time and motion study on how much more time it takes to clean up after the 6 to 6 Program. It takes 45 more minutes and the school district pays for that extra time. We contribute a small amount for extra toilet paper.

Q. Relative caregivers must use licensed child care, but these caregivers are not licensed. How do you accommodate the needs of these caregivers?
A. The 6 to 6 Program is license-exempt in two ways. Ninety-one of the schools are funded by the After School Safe Neighborhoods Program and they are license-exempt. The other schools funded by the City of San Diego are license-exempt because of AB 297 (Kehoe) passed a few years ago. Our greatest drawback today is the waiting list of 100 elementary school children.

Q. What are the San Diego program's ratios?

A. We subcontract with 21 community based organizations. We operate at a 1:15 adult-child ratio at the elementary level and a 1:20 ratio at the middle school level.

Q. Do you include children with disabilities?

A. Yes. We have been sensitive to including children with disabilities since we began. We created a pool of \$150,000 to provide inclusion aides for children with significant needs.

Q. Have you considered bringing in mental health professionals to deal with behavioral issues?

A. Yes. The largest of the provider agencies have strong mental health components with personnel who can counsel staff when they have difficult children. We have found that it is critical to work with the teachers from the school day. Also, we require a minimum of two credentialed teachers to help create that link as well as to help with homework. The full time site supervisor is at the school during the day and helps maintain the link as well.

Q. Are they included in your ratio count?

A. No, not the credentialed teachers. Each teacher works after school only one to two times a week and is paid a stipend lower than what they would receive as a teacher being paid time and a half.

Barbara Kraybill, Youth Services Superintendent, Livermore

Ms. Kraybill said her program provides a licensed before and after school care program through the Livermore Parks and Recreation Department. She will talk about relationships, risk management (including licensing), and education of staff. Relationships relate to ratios. A 1:20 ratio means that you have a child's one on one attention only three minutes out of an hour. In the business and the child care world, there is an 80/20 rule. This means that 80 percent of the time will be used on 20 percent of whatever is the focus. Thus, with a 1:20 ratio, 48 minutes out of an hour are spent on four of the 20 children and the remaining 16 students get the other 12 minutes, or 45 seconds each. A 1:4 ratio would be better in the after school setting. Ratios really do matter. It is important when looking at research studies to understand what the ratios mean, when, for example, the results indicate that a 1:20 ratio is adequate. Given the choice, anyone working with children would want a 1:10 ratio at the maximum. Age 9-14 is a time of moral development. This is when they decide whether they'll skip school, or watch "Sally Jesse Raphael" where they may see bad moral examples. They need an appropriate adult to child ratio so that an adult can be available to them when one is needed.

She said she applauds the 6 to 6 Programs because they use the best of licensing, but not all unlicensed programs do that. Licensed programs are important, licensing is just risk management. Children get sexually adventuresome in the bathroom, so it is important to know who is supervising them at this time. Licensing aids in program supervision because it provides a framework of requirements. Licensed care requires certain safety features to be provided, for example, fire alarms and emergency lights that work.

It is important to start developing self esteem early in life. Self esteem means you have a sense of belonging. Children need to feel that they belong, to a family, to a school, to an organization of some sort such as a church or YMCA, or a recreational group. They also need a sense of power, for example, to make certain choices. Choices are power. Children need to know how to make appropriate choices. Children need to know that something about them makes them unique, and they need a significant role model, someone in their life that they look up to. Are we providing good role models for our children? Children choose what they do in their leisure time. When there is nothing for them to do and no place for them to be, they will often end up in gangs. Gangs give them a place to belong where they have power, have a moniker, have a unique job, and have role

models of a variety of ages, all of who are other gang members. She said her program gives children choices to belong to a different kind of gang, the child care and after school program.

Education of the staff is critical. It is another licensing issue in disguise. Relationships are the key issue. Who are the people working with our children? We need to raise the bar for child care workers. We need to value them more. Providing affective education means that we provide support to children and their families. We need to set expectations for our children, to help them feel like capable, competent people, and help them learn to set boundaries for themselves. We need to help them learn constructive use of time through planned activities. They need people around them to help them learn to read and want to learn to read. We need people to help them become socially competent, to develop a positive identity and a sense of purpose, and someone to teach them how to get along with others.

Lindsay Callahan, Foundation Consortium

Ms. Callahan said the Foundation Consortium does not provide programs, so comments will focus on the statewide infrastructure they are working with and the training they are working to provide. The After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnership Program began with little or no money for training and technical assistance. The program was locally controlled and determined. The Foundation Consortium created a public-private partnership with the Department of Education (CDE) to provide training and technical assistance to local programs. They do this through 11 regions. The lead in each region is responsible for the training and technical assistance provided in that region. They have hired an intermediary named CFIRE, which has a team of mentors who give direct training to sites about issues such as curriculum development, staff development and training, etc. The mentors have been to about 70 percent of the 1000 sites in the state. The project is looking at how to create sustainable programs that have diversified funding because quality programs cannot be maintained with only one funding source. There is not much statewide data available so they are getting data from the evaluation components of local programs. The local evaluations include some behavioral data and accident data. The project is looking to the communities for model programs that use resources from the community in their after school programs. The schools and coordinators cannot do these programs alone. They encourage programs to open their doors to the community, and encourage the communities to look at themselves as a resource for after school programs.

Q. Deb, how much are you budgeting per child in the San Diego program? Does this include the in-kind for janitorial, etc.?

A. It is about \$1,000 per child per year. Nineteen of the 196 schools already had licensed child care. These are in high-end communities so those schools receive only a \$10,000 scholarship per school to bring in any children whose parents cannot afford the market rate care. That figure does not include the in-kind contribution from the school districts.

Q. How are children enrolled in the programs? What about children with disabilities?

A. In San Diego, we found that first come, first served doesn't work because it gives preference to stay-at-home parents. So we created an enrollment procedure. Families complete pre-enrollment forms. Priority goes to lower income families who receive the free and reduced lunch, and those who need the program five days a week.

A. In Livermore, the school age part of the program is funded through the Child Development Division. We have a limited amount for subsidized care. The lowest income children have the highest priority. We work with the school district to take children with special needs or who are at risk of being expelled. The elementary school review board can assign children to the program. The full-cost families are on a waiting list and are enrolled as space becomes available. Anyone who comes to the After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnership Program in the middle

schools is eligible. We do have a sliding fee scale because we have had difficulty finding matching funds.

Q. Are the schools that receive free lunches the larger schools?

A. Ninety-one of the schools in the San Diego Unified School District have 51 percent of the families qualifying for a free and reduced lunch. So we have long waiting lists of very poor families who cannot afford licensed child care.

Ms. Malaske-Samu thanked the panel. She commented that most of us work with younger children and we have a lot to learn on how to do a good job with school age children. We have a lot of work to do. She noted that Mr. Groginsky has a number of publications of interest, in particular, "Making Child Care Better: State Initiatives." He will provide copies to the Committee.

Legislation

AB 298 - *Kathy Dresslar*, Office of Darrell Steinberg, *Pat Dorman*, California Association for the Education of Young Children, *Donita Stromgren*, Child Care Resource and Referral Network

Kathy Dresslar is the Legislative Director for Assembly Member Steinberg. Before joining the Legislature, Mr. Steinberg championed the Sacramento Start after school program. The After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnership Program was created three years ago based on that model. That was a contentious process in the Legislature. This was shortly after the Legislature reformed the state welfare system. There was a push to get parents out to work, which increased the need for child care. At the same time, the state was grappling with failure in the education system. There were discussions about educational reform and accountability, and the Academic Performance Index (API) was born. Early results from the API show what we already knew -- academic performance suffers when schools have high numbers of low-income students, high numbers of new immigrants, and high numbers of non-English proficient students. In 1900, the United States was discussing whether homework was a good idea because children whose parents were educated would have the advantage of their assistance while children whose parents were less educated would not have that advantage. Our economy now requires much more education than it did then. In the 1980s when juvenile crime increased, society's view of youth suffered. Since we passed Proposition 21 where we may incarcerate children as young as 14 with adults, we have turned a corner and want to do something positive for our children. A coalition of six after school program review meetings was held three years into the program. The 1000-1200 participants included law enforcement, program operators, education professionals and paraprofessionals, and child advocates. They discussed how the program was working and how to improve it. AB 298 (Steinberg) contains many of the administrative fixes that came out of those meetings. It maintains the basic structure of the program. It streamlines the application processes, includes a Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA), and allows programs to be off site other than adjacent to a school site, as allowed in current law. In the more rural areas, there are transportation problems and they need a central location where everyone can be bussed to a program. AB 298 would allow school districts that flexibility while maintaining the requirement that the school be a partner and the fiscal agent and be responsible for making the final decision about whether this is the only way possible to have an after school program. She said she is here to "shop" this issue to the Committee today, but the bill is stuck in suspense. Assemblymember Cardenas is considering many items in AB 298 for inclusion into AB 6. Some of the contents in AB 298 may appear in AB 6. She asked the Committee to consider supporting the items in AB 298.

Ms. Malaske-Samu thanked Assemblymember Steinberg for sticking with us.

Pat Dorman, representing the California Association for the Education of Young Children, said there are three bills that address after school issues and would affect the existing program, AB 6,

AB 297, and AB 298. The first latchkey bill was passed in 1985. Those programs had to be licensed and were under the CDE, Child Development Division. In attempts to define child care in before and after school programs versus child care in parks and recreation programs, parks and recreation programs say they are no more than 20 hours and before and after school programs and licensed programs say they are more than 20 hours. Bills have attempted to allow unlicensed programs to provide more hours of unlicensed care. These three bills give us an opportunity to discuss what type of long-range safeguards we need to keep these programs running with quality care. What training should staff have? Should trained staff be paid more? Will the dollars be available to pay for these programs? We need to look into the future and not just think about today. We need to think of safeguards for these programs and ask our Legislators to fund them with the needed dollars. We need to be sure programs are licensed if they are offsite and that training and staff ratios are the best possible.

Donita Stromgren is here on behalf of the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network to support AB 298, a two-year bill, which may be combined with AB 6. The issue they most support in AB 298 is the expansion of the availability of the After School Learning and Safe Neighborhoods Partnership Program to serve more neighborhoods and more children. Society has changed and families and communities have different issues. These programs are addressing those needs. They provide a safe and developmentally appropriate environment for school children that is at or adjacent to their school site. The programs provide academic assistance and are linked to the schools. An editorial in today's Sacramento Bee quotes a young student's comments about the importance of having help with schoolwork and that the after school program is his sanctuary. We are pleased that the bill incorporates an annualized COLA. We also support the proposed increase in the reimbursement rate because \$5 a day per child, even with a local match, is not sufficient. We also like the requirement of a cash match rather than just in-kind. Most important from our perspective is to have statewide standardized requirements for after school programs both in the educational training requirements and background checks for staff.

Q. Ms. Schoenborn said she is concerned that the bill doesn't identify children with special needs and she would like this added to the bill.

A. There is a provision that requires accommodations for special needs children in proportion to the percent of children in that district with those needs.

Q. Would the author reconsider the 1:20 adult to child ratio?

A. Assemblymember Steinberg had UC Irvine conduct a study of after school programs that showed that safety concerns were being met, fewer children involved in these programs were being held back, fewer had to attend summer school to progress to the next grade, and students moved more rapidly from the limited English proficient class to the fluent English proficient class. He sees this program as the most cost-effective investment of Prop 98 money in addressing the needs of low performing schools. Given all this, he is reticent to reduce the ratios and thus diminish the numbers of children who have access to this program. The ratios need to be smaller with the younger children. But for children from 4th grade and up, parents have trouble keeping them in a child care or after school program. Parents say their children are excited about this program and it is a viable option that their children need.

It was moved and seconded to approve support of AB 298. Dr. Philibosian noted that she was making the motion with mixed feelings. While there is value to both sides of the staffing ratio issue, we are dealing with hordes of children out on the streets and we would prefer for them to be in some type of program no matter what the ratio. We are not satisfied that we have acceptable programs yet, but what we have now is better than the almost nothing we had 20 years ago.

Q. Can the bill be amended in the near future to address issues such as ratios and training or does a new bill need to be drawn up?

A. AB 298 can not be amended at this time. However, because it is supported by many law enforcement, children's, business and political organizations, we have given Mr. Cardenas ideas from AB 298 to think about including in AB 6.

The majority of the Committee voted to support AB 298. There were two votes in opposition and the two State staff members abstained.

SB 993 - Pamela Sorlagas, Public Policy Committee of the California Child Development Administrators Association (CCDAA). CCDAA is sponsoring SB 993, the Early Care and Education Act. Amendments to the bill add language that describes child development programs as educational programs. It describes state subsidized child development programs as providing services such as early brain development, language development, early literacy, educational enrichment, supervision, health and support services in full and part-time programs for children birth to 14 years. Although programs already provide these services, the language is not yet in regulations. This will lead to accountability in providing quality services. The bill provides a COLA in future years that will equal that of K-12. It raises state preschool eligibility, which currently is at 64 percent of state median income, to that of other state subsidized programs, which are at 75 percent. It allows children who are eligible for special education programs and special needs to enroll in state preschools as a way to integrate children and not be bound by income requirements. It requires staff training in age and developmentally appropriate curriculum. The bill originally increased program funding to address the problems of staff recruitment and retention, but this has been removed. We are hopeful the Budget Conference Committee will add money for a standard reimbursement rate increase. It is critical for programs to be able to increase staff salaries. The bill has support from law enforcement and education groups, two labor unions, Prop 10, Chambers of Commerce, and cities. SB 993 fits into the Governor's agenda for children entering kindergarten prepared to learn. A support position from the Committee is requested.

The Committee voted to support SB 993. There were two abstentions.

SB 390 - Nancy Strohl, Executive Director of the Child Care Law Center is here to ask for the Committee's support for SB 390. Last year CDPAC, the United Child Care Campaign, and the Child Care Law Center co-sponsored a process to develop a comprehensive framework for a Master Plan for child care. SB 390 was written with this framework in mind. The bill has moved out of the Senate and is now in the Assembly. It passed after it was amended to reduce the state appropriation to \$140,000 a year for two years. We made the commitment to raise \$360,000 a year from non-state sources to supplement the appropriation. This shows a good faith effort by the state, and we are confident the \$360,000 can be raised. The State Prop 10 Commission has been very supportive of the Master Plan. They believe that their School Readiness Initiative and work on the K-12 Master Plan interfaces with this Plan. Children with special needs are mentioned in the bill. She asked for the Committee's support of SB 390.

It was moved and seconded to support the bill.

Q. Will the change in the amount of funding change the recommended lead agency?

A. The bill was amended just last week. We have not yet met with the Department of Education about this possibility. The lead agency probably won't change, but the change in funding may change who is involved in the focus groups and other parts of the Plan.

Ms. Malaske-Samu said that in developing a Master Plan it is important to look beyond the subsidized system. The meshing of funding sources may help strengthen this process.

The Committee voted to support SB 390. There were two abstentions. Ms. Malaske-Samu thanked everyone who participated in this morning's agenda.

May Revise/Administrative Review

Dan Galpern, Senior Policy Analyst, California Budget Project (CBP)

Thank you for inviting me to discuss the 1) child care provisions contained in the May Revise and 2) the Administration's child care review. Some of what I'll say about the latter can be found in a short paper the California Budget Project published on May 30 (*Falling Short: The Administration's Child Care Review*, available at www.cbp.org).

1) Child Care Provisions in the May Revise

First, the May Revise increases Stage 2 child care by \$131 million. According to the Department of Finance, most of these dollars are federal CCDBG funds that came in after the January budget. These funds, combined with other federal and some carry-over state general funds were considered necessary to meet a 10% estimated increase in the Stage 2 caseload. This would mark the first major use of CCDBG funds for Stage 2 child care. To date nearly all of the funds for Stage 2 child care came from federal TANF and state general funds.

Second, the May Revise adds \$10 million to the quality improvement pot of funds, this is to meet a federal earmark for funding infant and toddler programs.

Third, and perhaps most interestingly, the May Revise contained no additional funding for Stage 3 child care.

The Stage 3 child care program, I should note, is the program that provides child care for families who have exhausted their two-year post CalWORKs child care entitlement. The practice in California has been to enable families to continue receiving their child care subsidy after Stage 2, so long as they are still working but have a low-enough income. The Governor's January budget documents said they were not funding any substantial increase in Stage 3 until the Administration completed a review of the state child care system and figured out what policy they wanted to promote for Stage 3 child care.

Out of deference to the Administration, the Assembly and Senate budget subcommittees held off increasing funding in Stage 3 throughout the winter and into the spring. Several times they were told that the recommendations would appear prior to the May Revise, and then with the May Revise. Yet by the time the May Revise was issued (May 14) the Review was still not out, and the May Revise still provided funding for only one month out of 12 in the budget year for families newly timing off Stage Two. However, the May Revise did caution that the cost of fully funding Stage 3 could rise to \$281 million in the Budget Year, an increase of 32%, and to \$629 million in 2004-05.

The budget subcommittees, out of their concern for families that would be left out by failure to fully fund Stage 3 next year – went ahead and augmented the item by the requisite \$66.2 million. However, they used one-time only funds for the increase, which encourages all parties to consider the policy question still alive.

Finally, a week after the May Revise, a report to the Administration, prepared by the State Consumer Services Agency (SCSA), called *Child Care Fiscal Policy Analysis* was released. This functioned as the long-awaited Administration's child care review. The review makes no firm recommendation about funding Stage 3.

Indeed, this was true on the gamut of issues facing the state subsidized child care system. Instead of advancing any particular policy proposals, the administration's review came up with seven scenarios. All of them differ slightly, but there is a common theme: all aim at serving more children within existing resources - or - without increasing state costs.

The scenarios accomplish this with several different strategies: Increasing fees on low income parents receiving subsidized care; lowering income eligibility levels for families attempting to qualify for or retain subsidies; lowering maximum child care payment rates; establishing time limits on child care subsidies; and reducing the maximum age of children who can receive subsidies from 13 to 12.

The scenarios are predicted to serve between 8,800 and 30,600 total additional children. These are net figures. Each scenario would also cut off thousands of currently served children from care. Others on waiting lists would take their slots, and additional slots would be generated from additional fees and lowered costs.

In fairness, I want to note that the author's of the review were following their mandate precisely: to come up with ways of serving more children within existing resources. The only surprise was that they didn't settle on any preferred option, but instead left it open for the Administration and Legislators to consider, or to reject, their scenarios.

Still, it is important to point out several of the limitations:

1. There is no real analysis of the potential impacts of eliminating child care subsidies from thousands of currently served families. But we think the impacts could be considerable. Take, as one example, the proposed option to reduce the income eligibility ceiling for subsidized child care from 75 percent of the state median income (SMI) to 65 percent of SMI. This would mean that a family of three with a monthly income of \$2,730 (70 percent of SMI for a family of three) would no longer be eligible for even a partial child care subsidy. But, based on typical state costs of living (including rent, transportation, food, and utilities) its likely that such a family may already be earning too little to pick up the full cost of child care without substantial financial sacrifice.

2. The report doesn't analyze families' ability to pay the proposed higher fees. All of the SCSA report scenarios raise fees either by raising the percentage of family income that could be charged or lowering the exemption threshold. The report notes that several states have higher fees and lower exemptions, but does not analyze how California's low income working families can be expected to pay additional fees.

3. Comparable concerns can be raised about proposals to limit child care payment rates.

4. What is omitted from the report may be as important as what is in it. None of the seven scenarios in the SCSA report allows the state to reach all the children who are eligible and in need of subsidized child care. To achieve this goal, additional funding will inevitably be needed.

5. One of the principal motivations for the entire report itself may be wrongly conceived. There is an assumption that a major inequity exists that short-changes so-called "working poor" parents in favor of providing child care to CalWORKs families. But as the paper CBP published in late May points out, it is misleading to compare the situation of a family on Stage 3 who may have a higher income than a typical family on a child care waiting list. A more appropriate comparison is to consider when that family applied for child care initially – i.e., as a CalWORKs applicant. At that time, the family by definition had income below 21 percent of the state median. Such a family most likely rises to the top of current child care waiting lists today.

To sum up, some of the larger problems inherent in the proposals may overwhelm the promise to serve additional children. It is unclear, to date, whether the Administration itself favors any of the seven sets of major policy changes and what, if anything, the Legislature is likely to do with them. One possible option is to fold these recommendations into the list of topics to be considered by a broader, more open, and more democratic planning group that could be charged with developing a master plan for child care in California. That might be a reasonable response.

Q. Aren't Prop 10 dollars going to be used to fund Stage 1? If so, how is that allowed? Wouldn't that be a supplantation issue?

A. Yes, that also is new. I believe it is permitted if the Prop 10 Commission decides to utilize the funds for that purpose. If the funds are used instead of currently existing dollars, there may be a supplantation issue. But if they are increasing service to the population, it is not supplantation.

A missing piece of the picture in the analysis is the contributions being made by the parents who are in the work force and contributing to the economy. The review just looked at what they are costing. It has been argued that some of those who would lose subsidized child care would be forced to leave their jobs. I believe the administration was mindful of that, but I don't think the full complement of problems was evaluated or promoted in any of the scenarios.

Q. According to the review, California is generous in its contributions to child care compared to other states. How did we arrive at these generous figures?

A. The author of the report believed that there is justification for making reductions because then we can serve additional families. The figures may be a result of strong advocacy in the state as well as our high cost of living.

Ms. Weber thanked Mr. Galpern for his outline. She noted that the report does cover what was asked for in the budget document. They were not asked to weigh pros and cons of the scenarios. Given their timeframe, it would have been difficult to have the policy discussions necessary to change state law. Regarding the equity issue, a genesis for this review was that we did not want CalWORKs to be the only entry into the subsidized child care system. As the numbers and costs increase, there are fewer resources for those at 21 percent of the state median income.

Q. How will the Prop 10 be disbursed?

A. If Prop 10 agrees to devote funds to Stage 1, the monies have to be tracked through a claiming process at the county level. They could not claim costs for children who were not eligible.

Ms. Malaske-Samu thanked Mr. Galpern for his analysis. The report shows the numbers of children who would lose subsidized care versus the number of children who would gain. This indicates the complexity of the decisions we are facing.

Reauthorization of the Child Care and Development Block Grant and TANF 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Lee Posey, Policy Specialist, National Conference of State Legislatures, Human Services Committee, Washington, D.C. Office

Ms. Posey said that next year, (FFY 2002), is the year for reauthorization of TANF and CCDBG. The Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) has a total of \$4.5 billion in federal funding for FFY 2001. She includes the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), both the mandatory and discretionary allocations, when talking about CCDBG.

CCDBG has three funding streams. The Mandatory Base Allocation has no state Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement, funds may be carried over from year to year, and there are no matching funds. The Mandatory Matching Funds have an MOE requirement of fiscal year 1994 or 1995 state spending on AFDC child care, they are matched by the federal government according to California's Medicaid matching rate of 50/50, and unused funds can be redistributed to other states. Discretionary funds, sometimes referred to as "old CCDBG," are subject to appropriation. The Discretionary fund set-asides include \$172 million for quality (in addition to the four percent minimum), \$19 million for resource and referral for school age, and \$100 million for infants and toddlers.

There are some basic rules for CCDBG funds. There is a four percent minimum for quality, and a five percent cap on administrative spending (which does not include licensing, inspection, and other services). Seventy percent of the funds must be spent to assist welfare recipients, those transitioning to work, and those at risk of going onto welfare. The federal maximum on income eligibility is 85 percent of state median income; states can set their own limit. They are intended to serve children under age 13. There are no time limits for recipients. CCDBG comes under the Brown amendment in the 1996 federal welfare reform law, which requires state legislators to appropriate TANF and CCDBG monies.

All states are spending all of their CCDBG funds. State health and safety standards must be met to prevent and control infectious diseases, for health and training, and for building safety. There are no funds for facilities.

The President's FFY 2002 Budget proposed \$2.2 billion in discretionary spending for CCDBG. That would be an increase of \$200 million. It includes a new after school certificate program, which would be a \$400 million set aside. It does not include funds for the Early Learning Fund, but this may be added back in by Senator Kennedy during this year's budget debate. There is very active congressional support for child care funding for next year.

Ms. Posey gave a brief outline of the Welfare Reform Act of 1996. It affected TANF, CCDBG, Medicaid, benefits for immigrants, Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Food Stamps, Child Welfare, and Child Support Enforcement. States are allowed to transfer 30 percent of their TANF funding into CCDBG, the Access to Jobs Program, or the Southern Services Block Grant (which has restrictions on the amount of the transfer and use of the funds).

Both the CCDBG and TANF bills must be reauthorized by October 1, 2002. Not much is happening at this point regarding Welfare Reform. It was not an issue in the presidential campaign last year, probably because there is a consensus that at least part of it is working. There are no major legislative proposals at this time. Those will be offered next spring or summer. Washington think tanks have been meeting and reviewing ideas. The NCSL is forming a task force to craft a position that will guide their lobbying office. What is happening, however, is congressional oversight through the Human Resources subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee chaired by Congressman Wally Herger from Northern California.

What happens if TANF is not reauthorized? There is no statutory requirement that every federal appropriation be reauthorized. However, House and Senate rules allow a challenge when funds are appropriated for a program that does not have current authorization. That challenge happens very infrequently. An example is the Older Americans Act, which was funded for five years without reauthorization. She outlined for the Committee the federal players in the TANF reauthorization debates, including the congressional committees, their chair and ranking minority member, and the heads of involved federal agencies. She noted that nearly everyone in Congress is new to the issue.

What will Congress be looking at in the process of reauthorizing TANF? They will look at how states are spending their reserve funds. Supplantation will be an issue in that discussion. They will look at work rates, job retention and earnings, and the numbers of families returning to welfare. There are indications that the population at the bottom of the economic scale may be worse off since Welfare Reform and they will want to know how to help these families. Family composition will be an issue. And they will want to know how states are treating those who fail to meet the requirements of the program. That is, are the sanctions real and being used?

The first funding issue discussed will be the amount of the federal block grant. It is approximately \$16.4 billion without the supplemental grants some states get. Some will argue that since caseloads have dropped by more than half, states should receive less money. The Heritage Foundation may propose and advocate for a reduction in the states' TANF block grant by 10 percent. States are arguing that they are doing more things with this money, that it no longer is just a cash assistance program. Another issue will be whether or not to change the state MOE. The size and triggers for the Contingency Fund will be talked about. The triggers may not be the right ones to enable states to gain access if the funds are needed, and the size is probably not sufficient if there is an economic downturn. They may discuss establishing requirements that certain portions of the funds be used for a specific purpose. And supplantation will be an issue.

All TANF and MOE expenditures must meet one of the four purposes of the program. (1) Provide assistance to needy families so children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives. (2) End the dependence of needy parents on government benefits by promoting job preparation, work and marriage. (3) Prevent and reduce the incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies and establish annual numerical goals for preventing and reducing the incidence of these pregnancies. (4) Encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families. The first two goals are about income eligibility, and three of the goals mention family formation. These purposes are a key area of flexibility for states. However, some people have concerns they feel should be addressed by all states. Some of the issues that will be talked about in reauthorization debates will be child poverty, fathers (how to reconnect low-income non-custodial fathers to their children), housing, and family formation. Modifications to the purposes or to the bonuses that reward states for how well they carry out the program could have a big impact on what states do.

Welfare Reform established a five year lifetime limit on how long a family can receive assistance with federal funds. States can use their own funds to provide assistance after five years. Twenty percent of the caseload can be exempt from this federal lifetime limit. Some argue that the lifetime limit clock should stop when someone is in the program and working and following the rules, that they should receive their assistance but it should not count against their lifetime limit. There are questions about those that have a disability and cannot reasonably be expected to work. There will be a question about whether state MOE flexibility can be maintained.

There is a need to clarify which programs are not assistance. Child care provides a perfect example of why the assistance/non-assistance distinction matters. If something is assistance, it counts toward the federal time limit. If it is non-assistance, it does not count toward the federal time limit. In the regulations, but not in the law, TANF funded child care for working families is not assistance. But child care for non-working families is assistance and kicks in the time limits.

What do we do while we are waiting? NCSL is advising states to continue to focus on work, getting people into jobs, retained and advanced. Child care is a part of this discussion. States should use the flexibility the federal government has given them. And they should spend the money in ways they can defend. Everyone with an interest in these issues should communicate with Congress and the administration.

Other issues probably will come up in the CCDBG reauthorization. The most important is funding, how much child care will the federal government fund? The trade-offs between flexibility and requirements will be discussed. The President's FFY 2002 proposal includes a set-aside for after school care. The interesting thing is that while he increased discretionary funds by \$200 million, the set-aside was \$400 million, which would mean reaching back into the money the states have now. The Leave No Child Behind Bill (S. 940), being supported by the Children's Defense Fund, would increase the four percent quality set-aside in the CCDBG and expand the one percent set-aside for training and technical assistance. So this will be an interesting issue from several angles. There will be discussions about federal versus state setting of standards. S. 940 would require two annual inspections for any facility accepting CCDBG funding. Eligibility, equity and training issues also will be discussed.

There also will be debates about the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLCs). The House has passed H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Bill. One section of the bill provides authorizations for separate block grants for 21st CCLCs, Safe and Drug-Free Schools, and Gun Free Schools, all under the same title. The Senate is debating S. 1, the Better Education for Students and Teachers Act. In that bill the 21st CCLCs are part of the Straight A's block grant. Senator Dodd will propose an amendment to take them out. The President's budget proposes a funding level of \$864 million for the 21st Century CCLCs, augmented by \$400 million for the after school certificate program in CCDBG, and \$15 million for matching grants to Veterans Mission for Youth, a mentoring-type program.

Q. What is the after school certificate program?

A. We understand it to be a type of voucher that parents could take to the after school program of their choice.

Q. We have heard there will be a greater focus on family formation, and that other states are promoting marriage. Can you shed any light on this?

A. Maryland just passed a marriage education bill, which offers a discount on the marriage license for couples who have attended and paid for pre-marital counseling. Louisiana passed a similar bill. Florida has had a major effort in marriage promotion. Arizona has been involved. The Heritage Foundation and other groups are pushing for a set-aside within TANF for promotion of marriage.

Q. Is there any data on the outcomes of these programs?

A. Ms. Posey said her organization has begun compiling this information. She will be glad to provide the Committee with available information.

Ms. Malaske-Samu thanked Ms. Posey for her informative presentation and offered congratulations to NCSL for their incredible staff. The audience gave Ms. Posey a round of applause.

California Children and Families Commission

Patti Huston and Judy Stucki, Children and Families Commission

Ms. Huston introduced Judy Stucki, a child development consultant with the Commission, who is their point person for the School Readiness component of the Master Plan. She said they are reporting on the School Readiness Initiative, the School Readiness component of the Master Plan, and the matching grant program for childhood educator compensation and retention.

The purpose of the School Readiness Initiative is to create school readiness centers and programs to improve the ability of families, schools and communities to prepare children to enter school ready to succeed. This will be accomplished by building culturally and linguistically appropriate connections

between families, communities, service agencies, early care and education providers and schools. The hope was for the School Readiness Initiative to be funded with state General Fund dollars in partnership with money from the state Commission and the county Prop 10 commissions and local resources. The state Commission has committed \$225 million over the next three to five years. They will prioritize neighborhoods served by low performing schools and have started an implementation plan. They hope to build on current resources and programs and at the same time restructure and coordinate the delivery of quality early care and education, health and social services, and parental education and support, plus improve the schools' readiness for children. The initiative is based on research, but each county program will be designed to respond to local needs. The state Commission will support the initiative by campaigning to educate the public.

Prop 10 commissions in five to 10 counties will be prepared to begin this fall. Twenty to 30 more counties are interested but will need resources and mentoring to build relationships and infrastructure before getting started. The first round of applications will be released in July with applications due September 30. Projects will be selected in October and implemented in November. The second round of applications will be released in December 2001 with applications due in March 2002. Selection and implementation will be in April and May 2002.

Ms. Stucki gave an update on the Master Plan. Two members of the Committee sit on the Master Plan work group, Michael Jett and Kathy Malaske-Samu. The work group has had two meetings. They are looking at a variety of things, including the dimensions of early learning. As a working definition, they adopted the National Education Panel's definition of school readiness, but the wording may be modified. They want to reach the families, parents and caregivers that nurture the children as well as the K-12 education professionals. It is their view that we need to build a powerful learning system where the public schools are ready for the children and the children are ready for school. They have developed a scope of work. They have defined the target age group as prenatal to age 8, so kindergarten through third grade will be counted as well as pre-K. A proposed table of contents has been developed and will be on the web site soon, www.ccfca.gov. The School Readiness Initiative can be reached through the senate website. The next work group meeting will be August 2-3. A demographer and a futurist will talk to the group because California's demographics are changing rapidly. They have developed 15 topic areas, and will break into subgroups to discuss them over the next few months, then report back to the work group on each topic. Five recommendations will be key to the report that will come from the sessions – (1) consider the whole child, (2) assure quality and equity and accessibility in all services for young children, (3) build an integrated system of institutions that serve children, (4) manage that system, and (5) build state, county, and local partnerships to improve early childhood learning.

Cheri Schoenborn commended the Commission on having a Diversity Advisory Committee and taking other steps to make sure they are including all children.

Ms. Huston said 14 counties submitted applications for the first round of the Child Care Provider Compensation Matching Grants Program, and 31 counties applied for the second round. The Letter of Intent was due May 24. The request for funding will go to the Commission on June 21.

Q. How does the Commission feel about the set aside for Stage 1?

A. Gravely concerned. Rob Reiner sent a letter to Senator Burton, Speaker Hertzberg, and the Governor, about it. In an effort to work with the state on the budget crisis, we looked at the budget for another place that our money could be used. We are still talking to the Governor's Office and the Legislature. We have heard from a number of our constituents and partners who are concerned about it. The Commission will talk more at the June 21 meeting and may vote on the issue then.

State Agency Reports

Cheri Schoenborn, Department of Developmental Services

The Department has been reorganized. There no longer is a Prevention and Children's Services Branch so the Early Start program is now under the Health and Developmental Services Branch. They will serve more children next year than was estimated last November for the Governor's Budget. At any point in time, they will be serving around 20,740 children, an increase of 425 over the estimate. Numbers have continued to go up since implementation of the Early Intervention Services Act. The outreach is identifying a lot more children. The amount of money being spent on purchase of service for children under age 3 also is impacting the Department. In 1998-99 it was around \$65 million. The current year expenditure will be around \$110 million, and next year it will be around \$128 million. There are several reasons for this – the comprehensiveness of the family service planning done when the children come in, the federal requirement that a family cannot be required to use their private insurance unless they agree to that, and the requirement of providing services within a natural environment rather than at a site where there are only children with disabilities. People are finally grasping the idea of providing services to children within the everyday routines of the family. People with disabilities are being integrated within our society from the very beginning and no longer are in segregated settings. This is better for everyone. The Department held a training in March on the topic of natural environment and will hold another training September 24-25 in South San Francisco.

The Department was notified by the Federal Office of Special Education Programs that California has been selected as one of 10 states to undergo a full scope monitoring of the implementation of the Part C Program. They did a focused review of California's system in 1998, identified some corrective actions and these are being worked on. This monitoring will place a broader spotlight on the state's entire Part C system. The first step will be a self-assessment with major stakeholders involved. They also will do a comprehensive family satisfaction survey.

This coming year they will develop training around the issues involved when providing services in natural environments, and providing additional support to the people going into those settings. The Department will be continuing its scholarship funds.

A couple of pieces of legislation impacted the Early Start program. SB 1096 was to revise the California Early Intervention Services Act by changing the definition of infant and toddler from birth through 3 (as defined in federal regulations) to birth to 5. The bill is in suspense and the sponsors are looking at other avenues to address the population served under Early Start that may be falling through the cracks at age 3. SB 511 is still active. It would expand the concept of federally funded family resource centers serving the birth to 3 population, with the intent of having family empowerment centers for the 3-22 population. It was last amended on June 4.

Michael Jett, Department of Education

The May Reviser reduced the COLA for child care programs from 3.91 to 3.87 percent reflecting the adjustment to the K-12 COLA. There is a minimum wage impact mitigation for \$5.4 million. The after schools program lost their \$20 million in half-year money. This may impact efforts to get the remainder of the lost COLA of \$44 million. Stage 2 was fully funded. Stage 3 set aside was fully funded at \$66 million, which is one-time-only money. The AB 212 CARES bill guidelines were approved by the Office of the Secretary for Education and the Department of Finance (DOF). The county plans are due tomorrow. That will enable CDE to encumber the \$15 million for this year by June 30. The contractor selected for the accreditation project that the Department is doing with the Prop 10 Commission is the California Association for the Education of Young Children. The plan for SB 1703 has been negotiated with the field, sponsors and DOF. The money will go out after the

plan is approved. The three program expansions are nearly completed. Awards for the \$80 million for general child care, 0-5, will be announced soon, as will awards for state preschool expansions. Applications for the \$6 million for migrant child development programs are due June 15. That process will move more quickly than the other two because there is no interview component. The renovation and repair grants and the playground safety grants also will be awarded soon. The Child Care and Development Fund State Plan will be submitted to the federal government by July 1.

Jo Weber, California Department of Social Services

Ms. Weber said she is getting back to the Committee on the late payments issue for CalWORKS child care that was discussed at the last meeting. An All County Information Notice (ACIN) Number 33-01 has been issued to help county welfare departments and alternative payment providers streamline the payment process. It can be accessed at www.dss.ca.gov. Counties and providers helped put it together. Counties handle the transition between stages differently. Some make payments on a flow basis rather than once a month. The providers that staff spoke with said late payments were a problem in the past but it has been getting better. They will talk with provider organizations to find out if late payments continue to be a problem statewide or if there are regional problems. State staff will follow up when they receive this information. We are looking at county expenditure rates for Stage 1 child care to find out if there is a funding shortage in any county and looking at ways to resolve it if we find a shortage. Stage 1 child care was fully funded in the May Revise (\$575 million to serve about 104,000 children). There also is a child care reserve made up of three pots of money – a hold-back of \$30 million of Stage 1 money, a hold-back of \$32 million of Stage 2 money, and \$90 million in reserve over and above the anticipated need. Either CDE or CDSS could access that reserve. CDSS is forming a work group to discuss CalWORKs participants' knowledge of and access to support services. They have heard from advocate communities that people are not aware that child care, transportation and other services are available to them. They will attend the first all-county meeting of the 2001-2003 California Infant-Preschool and Family Mental Health Initiative. It is a two-year project to pilot new approaches to the delivery of integrated mental health services for children ages 0-5 and their families.

Charlene Tressler asked if the Committee is interested in having someone make a presentation about what San Diego County is doing to pay providers quicker. Staff made a note of this.

Q. Regarding the expansion of after school programs discussed earlier, if some of the agencies want to be licensed is there an expedient way to get this done?

A. In the event there is a need, there is a group of ombudspersons that serve as liaisons between the Department and the communities. They could provide training and technical assistance to the agencies to help speed along the licensing process.

Ms. Malaske-Samu thanked everyone for another productive meeting.

Attendees of June 7, 2001 CDPAC Meeting

Committee Members:

Kathleen Malaske-Samu, Chairperson
Joyce DeWitt, Public Member
Bonnie Parks, Employment Department
Lynn Lucas, El Dorado County Supt. of School
Robert Orsi, Schoolhouse Development
Cheri Schoenborn, Dept. of Development of Services
Earl Peterson, Child Care Consultant

Joyce Hanson, Grandparent/Child Advocate
Evelyn Mason, Grandparent/Child Advocate
Michael Jett, Department of Education
Eleanor Moulton, EduCare
Jo Weber, CA Dept. of Social Services
Dianne Philibosian, Public Member
Dennis Mooney, Child Advocate

Participants:

Cheryl Allen, CEITAN
Donna Beveridge, San Bernardino LPC Coordinator
Dee Cuney, Private Child Care Network
Pat Dorman, On the Capitol Doorstep
Virginia Greenwald, CA Council of Churches
Charlene Tressler, CAPPA and
San Diego Child Care Planning Council
Pamela Sorlagas, LA Child Care/ Development
Kim Johnson, Children's Network of Solano County
Bob Garcia, U.S Dept of Health & Human Services
Marilyn Rotnem, Merced County Office of Education
Deanna Brown, CA Dept of Social Services
Sherry Novick, Assembly Human Service Committee
Christina Hioureas, Senator Sheila Kuehl
Donita Stromgren
Mary Arriaga

Mark Carlson, Lutheran Office of Public Policy
Edward Condon, CA Head Start Association
Ellen Hiuga, Community Care Licensing
Mei Kwong, Children's Home Society of CA
Linda Parfitt, CDD, CDE
Joyce Stone, Child Action
Larisa Casillas, Children Now
Sabah Eltareb, CA Research Bureau
Gisela G. Erne, Victor Valley College
Nancy Strohl, CCLC
Jody Windisch, Marin Child Care Council
Cynthia Jaynes, CDAPP
Barbara Coulibaly
Pat Talley
Steven Thaxton
Robbie Townsley

Staff:

Kay Ryan, Executive Director
Ronda Nelson, Analyst
Sharron Goldstein, Analyst

Sharon Rea-Zone, Analyst
Priscilla Jong
Alejandro Castillon